

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 11 and 20-28 are pending in this application, claim 11 having been withdrawn. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1 and 11 are amended, claims 2-10 and 12-19 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein, and claims 20-28 are added. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Abraham and Tucker at the interview held June 4, 2009, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview. The specification is amended as requested by the Examiners during the interview.

**I. The Objection is Moot**

The Office Action indicates that claims 8-10 would be objected to should claims 1-3 found allowable. This objection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 8-10. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akatsu (JP Patent Publication No. 02-254013); claims 4, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akatsu in view of Yokota et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,676,898); claims 6, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akatsu in view of Hashimoto (JP 2002-096633); and claims 7, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akatsu in view of Fisher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,544,458). The rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed, and the rejections of claims 2-10 and 12-19 are moot.

As agreed during the personal interview, Akatsu fails to disclose or render obvious an adhesive applying step continuously supplying an adhesive to a predetermined adhesion area of the covering member of the window pane and a predetermined adhesion area of at least one

of the positioning member and the holding portion so that the adhesive of both predetermined adhesion areas are continuous with each other via a predetermined adhesive connection area, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledges that Akatsu does not explicitly teach an adhesive applying step that adds adhesive continuously with a predetermined adhesion connection area. The Office Action further asserts that: 1) it would have been obvious to one of having the ordinary skill in the art to alter the separate adhesion application steps taught in Akatsu by using continuous adhesion in order to minimize preparation time prior to injection molding; and 2) it would have been obvious to one having the ordinary skill in the art to do so because where the result accomplished is substantially the same, steps taken concurrently or simultaneously are the equivalent of and not patentable over steps taken successively and relying on *New Wrinkle, Inc. v. Watson*, 96 USPQ 436, 437. The Office Action further asserts that "[a]s it pertains to this case, it would have been obvious to one having the ordinary skill in the [sic] to alter the teachings of Akatsu to utilize a continuous adhesive application step in order to reduce manufacturing time by adding a;; [sic] the adhesive in a single manufacturing step while still ensuring that there is no adhesive added to the material flow connection portion." These assertions are respectfully traversed.

It would not have been obvious to modify Akatsu as alleged by the Office Action because: 1) the alleged modification to Akatsu to continuously apply the adhesive would render method of Akatsu unsatisfactory for its intended purpose; and 2) the method of Akatsu does not achieve the same result as the claimed method.

Akatsu discloses separately and individually applying the adhesives 6 and 7 to the molding locations of the frame portion 2 and the mounting locations of stoppers 3 except the molding locations of the connecting portion. See, the English Translation of Akatsu, e.g., page 2, lines 39-44 and page 3, lines 1-11. Akatsu discloses that by forming the adhesives

independently, the connecting portion is not fastened to the window plate with the adhesive, thereby enabling simple removal of the connecting portion. See, the English Translation of Akatsu, e.g., page 2, lines 39-44. Thus, the alleged modification to Akatsu to continuously apply the adhesive would render the method of Akatsu unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. See MPEP §2143.01. Accordingly, as agreed during the interview, Akatsu teaches away from such a modification.

The method of Akatsu also does not achieve substantially the same result as the claimed method. As acknowledged by the Office Action, Akatsu does not disclose applying adhesive so that the adhesive of both predetermined adhesion areas are continuous with each other via a predetermined adhesive connection area. As discussed above, Akatsu discloses that the adhesives are to be applied separately and independently to the molding locations. Moreover, Akatsu does not disclose that these adhesives at the molding locations are connected. Accordingly, as argued during the interview, Akatsu does not disclose forming a predetermined adhesive connection area. Thus, it would not have been obvious to utilize a continuous adhesive application step as alleged by the Office Action.

Further, the other applied references do not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Akatsu.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Withdrawal of the rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Further, new claims are patentable over the applied references. For example, claims 20-27 depend from claim 1, and thus are also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Further, none of the applied references teaches or renders obvious the features of the adhesive applying step recited in claim 28. Akatsu is silent with respect to the procedure for applying the adhesive.

**III. Rejoinder**

Upon the allowance of claim 1, rejoinder and allowance of claim 11 is respectfully requested. See MPEP §821.04.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hs

Date: June 19, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--